

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action

Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Facility Name: Cabot Performance Materials Corporation
Facility Address: County Line Road, Boyertown, PA 19512-1608
Facility EPA ID #: PAD 00 233 5545

1. Has **all** available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwater media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?

☒ **X** If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.

☐ If no - re-evaluate existing data, or

☐ if data are not available skip to #6 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains **ONLY** to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database **ONLY** as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

2. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be “**contaminated**”¹ above appropriately protective “levels” (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?

_____ **X** If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate “levels,” and referencing supporting documentation.

_____ If no - skip to #8 and enter “YE” status code, after citing appropriate “levels,” and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not “contaminated.”

_____ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): The GW contaminated with Al, Ca, Mg, Mn, and TCE according to the 1) EPA, Region III Environmental Response Team (ERT) Removal Assessment Report dated November 2000 and 2) the Water Sampling Program Report dated August 17, 2000 prepared by Environmental Standards Inc, Cabot’s contractor, on the PADEP request in June- July of 2000.

¹ “Contamination” and “contaminated” describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate “levels” (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within “existing area of contaminated groundwater”² as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?

_____X If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the “existing area of groundwater contamination”²).

_____ If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the “existing area of groundwater contamination”²) - skip to #8 and enter “NO” status code, after providing an explanation.

_____ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): Contaminated groundwater plume is shown to be only on the Cabot site according to 1) EPA, Region III Environmental Response Team (ERT) Removal Assessment Report (Report) dated November 2000. According to Report, page 154: “the groundwater analytical data indicate that groundwater at residential locations is not affected by industrial contaminant.” Few TCE plumes are existed in the groundwater below the facility, TCE was used on the site in 1950th. One known to the facility plume is migrating to the boundary at Swamp Creek. “The analytical results indicate that the facility has impacted the groundwater” (Report, Page 162). The 1990 sampling on the other from the facility site Swamp Creek did not show any of groundwater contamination; the Creek acts like a boundary for the groundwater contaminants. Swamp Creek sampling shows overall good stream quality, according to the NPDES program data the Cabot’s groundwater has no measurable impact on the Swamp Creek water quality. “Groundwater [in the area] most likely contains elevated element concentration due to natural sources,” and agricultural activities. (Report, page 154);2) the Water Sampling Program Report dated August 17, 2000. The groundwater analytical data review indicates that the groundwater in the Southwest portion of Cabot facility is contaminated with boron, fluoride, chloride, sulfate, manganese, calcium, as well as VOC (trichloroethene) and its degradation products. The Northeast area of Cabot facility is contaminated with chloride, potentially sulfate, selenium, and calcium. The water collected from “underdrains” in the area of impoundments (lagoons) contained elevated concentration of boron, fluoride, chloride, sulfate, selenium, calcium and potassium. Low levels of VOCs related to pesticides were detected. The groundwater in the area is impacted by the Cabot facility and specific natural conditions, and agricultural activities; 3) according to the groundwater Flow Model the plum is in the property boundary ; 4) all private wells in the area were investigated. The majority (about 70%) of residential drinking water wells are having an increased boron concentration. Residential wells are not affected by the industrial activities. A number of residential wells contain contamination (aluminum, arsenic, boron, copper, fermium, manganese, lead, selenium, vanadium) above levels of potential concern for human health due to natural sources.

² “existing area of contaminated groundwater” is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of “contamination” that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all “contaminated” groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of “contaminated” groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

4. Does “contaminated” groundwater **discharge** into **surface water** bodies?

_____X If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.

_____ If no - skip to #7 (and enter a “YE” status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater “contamination” does not enter surface water bodies.

_____ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): An Aquatic Biology Investigation of Swamp Creek conducted in 1992 by the PADEP indicated overall good stream quality. During March 1999 monitoring of Cabot’s discharges of treated process water in the Swamp Creek floride, molybdenum, selenium, zinc, and other monitored pollutants met NPDES Permit levels. The Cabot’s groundwater has no measurable impact on the Swamp Creek surface water quality.

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

5. Is the **discharge** of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water likely to be “**insignificant**” (i.e., the maximum concentration³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate groundwater “level,” and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?

_____ **X** If yes - skip to #7 (and enter “YE” status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration³ of key contaminants discharged above their groundwater “level,” the value of the appropriate “level(s),” and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement of professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.

_____ If no - (the discharge of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration³ of each contaminant discharged above its groundwater “level,” the value of the appropriate “level(s),” and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations³ greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater “levels,” the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.

_____ If unknown - enter “IN” status code in #8.

Rationale and Reference(s): The Cabot’s GW has no measurable impact on the Swamp Creek surface water quality. An Aquatic Biology Investigation of Swamp Creek conducted in 1992 by the PADEP indicated overall good stream quality. During March 1999 monitoring of Cabot’s discharges of treated process water in the Swamp Creek fluoride, molybdenum, selenium, zinc, and other monitored pollutants met NPDES Permit levels. The Cabot’s groundwater has no measurable impact on the Swamp Creek surface water quality.

³ As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

6. Can the **discharge** of “contaminated” groundwater into surface water be shown to be “**currently acceptable**” (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented⁴)?

_____ **X** If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site’s surface water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater; OR 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment,⁵ appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is (in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be considered in the interim-assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated with discharging groundwater) include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface water/sediment contamination, surface water and sediment sample results and comparisons to available and appropriate surface water and sediment “levels,” as well as any other factors, such as effects on ecological receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic surveys or site-specific ecological Risk Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate for making the EI determination.

_____ If no - (the discharge of “contaminated” groundwater can not be shown to be “**currently acceptable**”) - skip to #8 and enter “NO” status code, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.

_____ If unknown - skip to 8 and enter “IN” status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): March 1999 monitoring of Cabot’s discharges of treated process water in the Swamp Creek fluoride, molybdenum, selenium, zinc, and other monitored pollutants met NPDES Permit levels. The Cabot’s GW has no measurable impact on the Swamp Creek surface water quality.

⁴ Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

⁵ The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

7. Will groundwater **monitoring** / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the “existing area of contaminated groundwater?”

_____ **X** If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the “existing area of groundwater contamination.”

_____ If no - enter “NO” status code in #8.

_____ If unknown - enter “IN” status code in #8.

Rationale and Reference(s):

The groundwater will continue annual monitoring for the natural attenuation indicators. The PADEP on Sept.15, 2000 recommended “natural attenuation as the method of remediation for the remaining [VOC (TCE)]contamination, due to their initial findings that natural attenuation processes are going on at the site...” Current July 14,2000 “Comprehensive Water Quality Report” detected TCE levels range from “non-detect” to 2.8mg/l.

In the area of two impoundments no further work is needed with respect to the groundwater.

The groundwater monitoring will continue at the Swamp Creek stream on the annual basis.

**Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)**

8. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).

 X YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the **Cabot Performance Materials Corporation** facility, **EPA ID # PAD 00 233 5545**, located at **County Line Road, Boyertown, PA 19512-1608**. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing area of contaminated groundwater" This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

 NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.

 IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by (signature) _____ Date 05-9-01
 (print) Victoria IOff
 (title) Remedial Project Manager

Supervisor (signature) _____ Date 08-09-01
 (print) Paul Gotthold
 (title) PA Operations Branch Chief
 EPA, Region 3

Locations where References may be found:

1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) IOff, Victoria
(phone #) 215-814-3415
(e-mail) ioff.vickie@epa.gov